

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 12-19 and 21-47 were pending in this application. Applicant adds claims 48 to 47 in this Amendment. The Examiner has previously allowed claims 12-18, 22-27, 30-35 and 47 and has indicated that claims 8, 36 and 44-46 would be allowed if amended to address a few minor concerns.

Claim 46

Applicant has amended claim 46 to correct the dependency as noted by the Examiner.

Claim 19

The Examiner has rejected claim 19 as anticipated by Paulsen (US 2,893,665). The Examiner has referred to the inner and outer surfaces of the annular mass 8 in Paulsen as the "inner and outer walls." Applicant believes this interpretation to be unreasonable; however, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has further clarified claim 19 to recite that the outer wall is spaced from the outer surface of the inner wall to further distinguish a single wall, such as in Paulsen. Therefore, claim 19 is patentable over Paulsen.

Claims 1, 5, 28, 29, 37-40, 42 and 43

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 28, 29, 37-40, 42 and 43 as obvious over Paulsen in view of Kritzer (US 1,926,392). As the Examiner apparently agrees, Paulsen does not disclose an opening that allows the attachment member to move laterally within

RPC 0456 PUS
Serial No. 09/688,780

the opening or to be insertable in any of a plurality of positions. However, there is no motivation in either Paulsen or Kritzer for modifying the opening in Paulsen to an elongated opening. In fact, there are several reasons why it would not be desirable to do so.

Kritzer teaches a plurality of elongated slots that are fixed relative to one another for the purpose of mounting a motor 26 connected to a belt (Fig. 1 of Kritzer). Because the positions and orientations of the plurality of slots 32 in Kritzer are fixed relative to one another, they are elongated in order to accommodate motors 26 with differently spaced bolt holes. The elongated slots 32 also provide a rough adjustment of the belt tension.

The reason for the elongated slots 32 in Kritzer does not provide motivation that is applicable to Paulsen. The Paulsen device does not include a plurality of openings that are fixed relative to one another. Instead, each device only includes one opening and each device can be positioned independently of the others. For example, four individual Paulsen devices could be connected to a machine or motor with bolt holes of almost any spacing, independent of the spacing and orientation of the bolt holes on the machine or motor. Therefore, the reason for elongating the holes in Kritzer does not apply to the Paulsen device and there is no motivation in either Paulsen or Kritzer to elongate the holes in the Paulsen device.

Additionally, an elongated opening in the Paulsen device (which is not taught by either reference) would also disrupt the balanced flexibility sought by the Paulsen invention. The purpose of the Paulsen device is to have high flexibility when the device is subject to a static force F (Fig. 4), and a high rigidity when subject to an overload force

RPC 0456 PUS
Serial No. 09/688,780

(Fig. 5 and col. 2, line 60 through col. 3, line 37). If the fastener 18 were not attached in the middle of the Paulsen suspension device, the controlled, balanced flexibility of the annular mass 8 would be disrupted, defeating the purpose of the Paulsen invention. Since the proposed modification would render the prior art invention described in Paulsen unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. MPEP 2143.01.

For these reasons, claims 1, 5, 28, 29, 37-40, 42 and 43 are not obvious.

Claims 2-4 and 6

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-4 and 6 as obvious over Paulsen in view of Kritzer and in further view of Nishitani (US 4,051,787). There is no motivation for making this proposed combination. There is no suggestion in any of the references that there would be a need or desire for adding anti-slip surfaces to suspension devices for connecting engines inside cars.

Claim 6 further specifies that the top wall includes an undersurface having a plurality of ribs. It would not make sense (and would not be obvious) to add ribs to the undersurface of the upper plate 7 in Paulsen. The Examiner's stated motivation is "to provide reinforcement for the top wall," but the purpose of the Paulsen device is for the upper plate 7 to collapse on the side wall (Figs. 4 and 5) in a controlled manner. The upper plate 7 in Paulsen is metal, while the side walls are rubber. The upper plate does not need any reinforcement ribs, because the rubber side walls will collapse long before the upper plate 7 fails. Additionally, ribs cannot be added to the upper plate 7 to *prevent* its collapse, since this would defeat the purpose of Paulsen, which is to collapse from the

RPC 0456 PUS
Serial No. 09/688,780

position shown in Fig. 4 to that shown in Fig. 5. Therefore, it would not be obvious to add ribs to Paulsen.

Claim 41

The Examiner has rejected Claim 41 as obvious over Paulsen in view of Grieser (5,878,984). Again, it would not make sense (and therefore it would not be obvious) to add ribs between the side wall 8 and the bottom plate 6 of the Paulsen device. The ribs would interfere with the purpose of the Paulsen device, i.e. collapsing under a certain force from the condition in Fig. 4 to that of Fig. 5. Therefore, claim 41 is patentable.

Claim 44

The Examiner has indicated that claim 44 would be patentable if amended into independent form. Applicant has amended claim 44 into independent form, omitting the phrase regarding nesting from claim 42 (from which claim 44 depended) and placing that phrase in new dependent claim 48. This phrase was not necessary to the patentability of claim 44. Therefore, claim 44 is patentable.

Claims 49 to 57

Applicant has added new claims 49 to 57. New claims 49 to 57 specify an outer perimeter wall spaced outwardly from an exterior surface of the interior wall. Such is not disclosed by Paulsen, as explained above. Further, claim 49 specifies that an uppermost portion of the outer perimeter wall is below an uppermost portion of the perimeter wall. Claim 53 specifies that the outer perimeter wall extends substantially vertically and is

RPC 0456 PUS
Serial No. 09/688,780

spaced away from the exterior surface of the perimeter wall. New claims 54-57 specify a cutout portion in the outer perimeter wall (disclosed in the present application as handle 30 in Figure 1 and discussed at page 8, lines 3-6). Paulsen does not disclose a cutout portion, nor could a portion of the wall in Paulsen be cut out.

Conclusion

Please charge deposit \$438.00 to Deposit Account No. 50-1984 for ten additional claims total and three additional independent claims in excess of three. If any additional fees or extensions are due, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-1984.

Respectfully submitted,



Konstantine J. Diamond
Registration No. 39,657
4010 East 26th Street
Los Angeles, California 90023
Telephone: (323) 262-5145
Facsimile: (323) 269-8506

Dated: October 30, 2003